

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Albert Luther Jeffcoat;)	C/A 8:06-1563-GRA-BHH
)	
Plaintiff;)	
)	
vs.)	Report and Recommendation
)	
Sonny Purdue; Mark Taylor; Thurbert Baker; Cliff)	
Brashier; John R. Harbey; William E. Woodrum; F.)	
Gates Peed; John R. Turner; Richard Mallard; Keith)	
McIntyre; Jon Hope; Verna H. Phillips; Erick Riner;)	
Elizabeth Holbrook; Jimmy McDuffie; Mike Kile; Mike)	
Bohannon; Tom Murphy; Steve Sweeny; Larry Carroll;)	
Robert Lanier, Jr.; Richard Rafter; Tony May; and Hilda)	
E. Partridge;)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The Plaintiff, Albert Jeffcoat, (hereafter, “the Plaintiff”), brings this action *pro se* seeking relief pursuant to Title 42 United States Code §1983. Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in such *pro se* cases and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

BACKGROUND

It appears from the complaint that the Plaintiff is the defendant in a pending criminal prosecution in the state courts of Georgia. Plaintiff alleges a number of constitutional violations that have occurred in the course of this criminal proceeding. As defendants, Plaintiff names Georgia state judges, law enforcement officers, prosecuting officers, private attorneys, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Georgia and other citizens of that State. From the summons forms filed by Plaintiff, it

does not appear that any defendants are citizens of South Carolina. While not all of Plaintiff's claims are clearly understood, his essential request is that this Court assume jurisdiction over the criminal prosecution.

Pro Se COMPLAINT

Plaintiff is a *pro se* litigant, and thus his pleadings are accorded liberal construction. *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5 (1980); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Loe v. Armistead*, 582 F. 2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978); *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F. 2d 1147 (4th Cir. 1978). *Pro se* pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Hughes v. Rowe*, *supra*. Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* Complaint is still subject to summary dismissal. Liberal construction means only that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so. *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128 (10th Cir. 1999). A court may not construct the plaintiff's legal arguments for him or her. *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411 (7th Cir. 1993). Nor should a court "conjure up questions never squarely presented." *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985).

NO PERSONAL JURISDICTION

United States District Courts, as federal courts established by the United States Congress, are limited in their jurisdiction to "federal question" and "diversity" cases pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1332. An action for violation of civil rights under 42 U.S.C. §1983, for example, is a "federal question" case which means that Congress establishes by statute the basis contours of litigation to enforce its provisions.

“Diversity” jurisdiction exists when the parties are citizens of different states and a minimum jurisdictional amount is at stake.

Federal courts are “constrained to exercise only the authority conferred by Article III of the Constitution and affirmatively granted by federal statute.” *In re Bulldog Trucking, Inc.*, 147 F.3d 347, 352 (4th Cir. 1998). There is no presumption that a federal court has jurisdiction over any given matter. *Pinkley, Inc. v. City of Frederick*, 191 F.3d 394, 399 (4th Cir. 1999) (*citing Lehigh Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Kelly*, 160 U.S. 337, 327 (1895)). Accordingly, a federal court is required, *sua sponte*, to determine if a valid basis for its jurisdiction exists, “and to dismiss the action if no such ground appears.” *Bulldog Trucking, supra*. See also Rule 12(h)(3) Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (Fed. R. Civ. P.) (“Whenever it appears . . . that the court lacks jurisdiction of the subject matter, the court shall dismiss the action.”). Although the absence of subject matter jurisdiction may be raised at any time during the case, determining jurisdiction at the outset of the litigation is the most efficient procedure. *Lovern v. Edwards*, 190 F.3d 648, 654 (4th Cir. 1999).

A bedrock requirement in any action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is that the district court in which a complaint is brought shall have personal jurisdiction over the person(s) of the defendant(s). Rule 4(e) Fed. R. Civ. P. (“Service Upon Individuals Within a Judicial District of the United States”) by its own title suggests that persons outside a given judicial district cannot be brought into that district court. The Rule, however, allows application of so-called state “long arm” statutes:

Unless otherwise provided by federal law, service upon an individual from whom a waiver has not been obtained and filed,

other than an infant or an incompetent person, may be effected in any judicial district of the United States:

(1) pursuant to the law of the state in which the district court is located, or in which service is effected, for the service of a summons upon the defendant in an action brought in the courts of general jurisdiction of the State....

Under South Carolina law, nonresidents may be served and subjected to state court jurisdiction, under the provisions of S.C. Code Annotated § 36-2-803 ("Personal jurisdiction based upon conduct"):

(1) A court may exercise personal jurisdiction over a person who acts directly or by an agent as to a cause of action arising from the person's

- (a) transacting any business in this State;
- (b) contracting to supply services or things in the State;
- (c) commission of a tortious act in whole or in part in this State;
- (d) causing tortious injury or death in this State by an act or omission outside this State if he regularly does or solicits business, or engages in any other persistent course of conduct, or derives substantial revenue from goods used or consumed or services rendered, in this State; or
- (e) having an interest in, using, or possessing real property in this State; or
- (f) contracting to insure any person, property or risk located within this State at the time of contracting; or
- (g) entry into a contract to be performed in whole or in part by either party in this State; or
- (h) production, manufacture, or distribution of goods with the reasonable expectation that those goods are to be used or consumed in this State and are so used or consumed.

(2) When jurisdiction over a person is based solely upon this section, only a cause of action arising from acts enumerated in this section may be asserted against him....

Comparison of the foregoing list with the Complaint demonstrates that this Court is without jurisdiction over any of the named Defendants. It is recommended that

this action be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance or service of process upon the Defendants. Plaintiff's attention is directed to the Notice on the following page.

Respectfully Submitted,



BRUCE H. HENDRICKS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

May 24, 2006
Greenville, South Carolina

**Notice of Right to File Objections to Magistrate Judge's "Report and Recommendation"
& The Serious Consequences of a Failure to Do So**

The petitioner is hereby notified that any objections to the attached Report and Recommendation must be filed within **ten (10) days** of the date of its filing. 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Based thereon, this Report and Recommendation, any objections thereto, and the case file will be **delivered to a United States District Judge** fourteen (14) days after this Report and Recommendation is filed. A magistrate judge makes only a recommendation, and the authority to make a final determination in this case rests with the United States District Judge. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-271 (1976).

During the ten-day period, but not thereafter, a party must file with the Clerk of Court specific, written objections to the Report and Recommendation, if he or she wishes the United States District Judge to consider any objections. **Any written objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** See *Keeler v. Pea*, 782 F. Supp. 42, 43-44 (D.S.C. 1992). Failure to file specific, written objections shall constitute a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the United States District Judge. See *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n. 4 (4th Cir.); and *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-847 & nn. 1-3 (4th Cir. 1985). Moreover, if a party files specific objections to a portion of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, but does not file specific objections to other portions of the Report and Recommendation, that party waives appellate review of the portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which he or she did not object. In other words, a party's failure to object to one issue in a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation precludes that party from subsequently raising that issue on appeal, even if objections are filed on other issues. *Howard v. Secretary of HHS*, 932 F.2d 505, 508-509 (6th Cir. 1991). See also *Praylow v. Martin*, 761 F.2d 179, 180 n. 1 (4th Cir.) (party precluded from raising on appeal factual issue to which it did not object in the district court). In *Howard, supra*, the Court stated that general, non-specific objections are *not* sufficient:

A general objection to the entirety of the [magistrate judge's] report has the same effects as would a failure to object. The district court's attention is not focused on any specific issues for review, thereby making the initial reference to the [magistrate judge] useless. * * * This duplication of time and effort wastes judicial resources rather than saving them, and runs contrary to the purposes of the Magistrates Act. * * * We would hardly countenance an appellant's brief simply objecting to the district court's determination without explaining the source of the error.

Accord Lockert v. Faulkner, 843 F.2d 1015, 1017-1019 (7th Cir. 1988), where the Court held that the appellant, who proceeded *pro se* in the district court, was barred from raising issues on appeal that he did not specifically raise in his objections to the district court:

Just as a complaint stating only 'I complain' states no claim, an objection stating only 'I object' preserves no issue for review. * * * A district judge should not have to guess what arguments an objecting party depends on when reviewing a [magistrate judge's] report.

See also *Branch v. Martin*, 886 F.2d 1043, 1046 (8th Cir. 1989) ("no de novo review if objections are untimely or general"), which involved a *pro se* litigant; and *Goney v. Clark*, 749 F.2d 5, 7 n. 1 (3rd Cir. 1984) ("plaintiff's objections lacked the specificity to trigger *de novo* review").

This notice apprises the petitioner of the consequences of a failure to file specific, written objections. See *Wright v. Collins, supra*; and *Small v. Secretary of HHS*, 892 F.2d 15, 16 (2nd Cir. 1989). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections addressed as follows:

**Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 10768
Greenville, South Carolina 29603**